

RINCON BAND OF LUISEÑO INDIANS

Culture Committee

1 W. Tribal Road · Valley Center, California 92082 ·
(760) 297-2621 or (760) 297-2622 & Fax: (760) 749-8901



August 19, 2013

County of San Diego
Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
San Diego, CA 92123

Re: Lilac Hills Ranch Master Planned Community project, SCH No. 2012061100

Dear Mr. Mark Slovick,

Rincon is submitting these comments in response to the draft Environmental Impact Report.

RINCON TRIBE CULTURAL AFFILIATION TO PROJECT AREA

D. L. true, C. W. Meighan, and Harvey Crew (1974:43) stated that the California archaeologist is blessed "with the fact that the nineteenth-century Indians of the state were direct descendants of many of the Indians recovered archaeologically, living lives not unlike those of their ancestors." Similarly, the Tribe knows that their ancestors lived in the land and that the Luiseño peoples still live in their traditional lands. While we agree that anthropological and linguistic theories as well as historic accounts are important in determining traditional Luiseño territory, the Rincon Tribe asserts that the most critical sources of information used to define our traditional territories are our songs, creation accounts and oral traditions. The Rincon Tribe has specific cultural and legal interest in the Lilac Hills Ranch Project. The project property is located within Luiseño ancestral territory and the Tribe is culturally affiliated with the geographic area. The Tribe also has specific knowledge of cultural resources and sacred places within/near the proposed Project alignments. Therefore further asserts that this culturally sensitive area is affiliated specifically with the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians because of the specific cultural ties to this area. Rincon considers any resources located on this Project property to be Luiseño therefore Rincon cultural resources, and do to its proximity to Rincon the Tribe asserts it's right to be named the Most Likely Descendent (Cal. Pub. Res. C. §5097.98) in case human remains are uncovered.

PROJECT IMPACTS TO CULTURAL RESOURCES AND PROPOSED TREATMENT FOR CULTURAL RESOURCES

Under the heading of "Cultural Environment " is the sub-heading of "General Cultural History" pages 8 to 10 the authors discussing the multiple archaeological manifestations of Native Americans in the San Diego area generalize is generalized into a discussion about the prehistory of San Diego County. The San Dieguito complex followed by the La Jolla complex followed by the La Jolla complex, along

Bo Mazzetti
Tribal Chairman

Stephanie Spencer
Vice Chairwoman

Steve Stallings
Council Member

Laurie E. Gonzalez
Council Member

Frank Mazzetti III
Council Member

RINCON BAND OF LUISEÑO INDIANS

Culture Committee

1 W. Tribal Road · Valley Center, California 92082 ·
(760) 297-2621 or (760) 297-2622 & Fax:(760) 749-8901



with the Encinitas tradition that equates with the Millingstone horizon, also known as Early Archaic or Milling Archaic. The discussion about the differences between the San Luis Rey (SLR) complex page 10 addresses the two phases SLR I thought to date from A.D. 1400 to A.D. 1700 and SLR II dating between A.D. 1700 and A.D. 1850 the authors point out that the assumption that the Luiseño did not practice pottery manufacture until just prior to the arrival of the Spanish needs to be revised. The tribe agrees that it should be revised, this is supported by the recent data coming from the reevaluation of the éxva Teméeku collection where pottery was found in an excavation level below an obsidian hydration date of $6,000 \pm 100$ years before present, Masiel-Zamora (2013:50). The Rincon tribe in general has no argument with the scientific data that has been presented in this report. We do take exception to the fact that archaeologists have a tendency to focus on only one or two Luiseno territory maps while the Luiseno people have to contend with at least eight different representations of the Luiseno territory, the authors used two for their representation. As discussed above the Rincon Tribe asserts that while anthropological and linguistic theories as well as historic accounts are important in determining traditional Native American territories, the most critical sources of information used to define our territory are our songs, creation accounts and oral traditions (see Myra Ruth Masiel-Zamora 2013 Master's Thesis).

Ethnography

The authors page 11 discussing the native people make reference to the Luiseño language and make the following observation "The Luiseño language belongs to the Cupan group of the Takic subfamily, which has also been called Southern California Shoshonean and is part of the widespread Uto-Aztecan language family. As is often the case with CRM reports the use of San Luis Rey I and II as cultural adaptations is all too often associated with the San Luis Rey Mission Indians and the Numic spread and/or the Shoshonean intrusion. The Tribe would like to point out that Shoshonean is a language within the Numic family of languages and is directly associated with the Great Basin area of California and Nevada. The Luiseño language belongs to the Takic family of languages and is generally associated with the southwest and Northern Mexico. While both the Numic and Takic family of languages belong to the greater grouping of Uto-Aztecan languages they are separate and distinct families, as are the languages in each family. As pointed out above and argued below these associations often lead to misrepresentation of Luiseño Territory and lifeway's. In addition, Sutton (2009) has suggested that the Cupan speaking people may have arrived in this area as early as 3000 BP. Using San Luis Rey I and II to argue for a recent intrusion of a separate Shoshonean Cultural Tradition directly contradicts the information provided to us by our elders.

Settlement Patterns

Sparkman(1908) and Strong(1972[1929]) have described the Luiseño social organization/community as consisted of one or more lineages, each comprising several related nuclear families, with the family being the smallest unit and the clan comprising two or more families grouped

Bo Mazzetti
Tribal Chairman

Stephanie Spencer
Vice Chairwoman

Steve Stallings
Council Member

Laurie E. Gonzalez
Council Member

Frank Mazzetti III
Council Member

RINCON BAND OF LUISEÑO INDIANS

Culture Committee

1 W. Tribal Road · Valley Center, California 92082 ·
(760) 297-2621 or (760) 297-2622 & Fax: (760) 749-8901



together. The Luiseño were thus sedentary, territorial, with the extended families residing in villages with individual living areas separated anywhere from $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile to $\frac{1}{2}$ a mile apart. Bean⁶ argued that a village foot print covers an expansive area, with each family having its own milling feature is supported when he argues that “homes were located some distance apart to provide privacy for families and that a village might occupy three to five square miles”. Oxendine⁷ makes the same argument about the post-contact Luiseño people. This is also supported by Kroeber(1976) and Heizer(1978) who used ethnographic data to describe Luiseño Indians’ settlement pattern as consisting of permanent villages located in proximity to reliable sources of water, and within range of a variety of floral and faunal food resources, which were exploited from temporary camp locations surrounding the main village (emphasis the authors). Each village of 75-200 people was occupied by one or more patrilineal clans and frequently, a number of communities would combine to celebrate important festivals, harvest cycles, and other ceremonial events, occasionally inviting distant, linguistically unrelated groups. Expanding on this general description, True and Waugh(1982:35) described Luiseño settlement patterns as;

The bipolar settlement pattern of the San Luis Rey was represented by relatively permanent and stable villages (both winter and summer), inhabited by several groups exploiting well-established territories and resources that were defended against trespass (we follow Flannery [1976:164] in using “village as a generic term for any small permanent community”), they saw this as a result of a reasonably long process of adaptation during which several strategic changes take place in settlement location patterns and in procedures for collecting resources. These strategic changes included a “trend toward the congregation of people along the major tributaries, with each tributary and its immediate environs occupied and exploited by a family-based kin group of some kind.

The Rincon tribe would ask archaeologist when is a Village a Village, can you describe Village activity areas? It is our view that Cultural Resource Archaeology by its very nature makes any argument about village settings in Southern California problematic at best, because most work is driven by development thus it is area specific therefore project specific and subject to time restraints as such it is not driven by larger research questions, but is usually limited to, in most cases, the surrounding one mile radius of the project area. This has given rise to most bedrock mortars and slicks being identified as either **temporary camp sites** or **seasonal camp sites**, without regard to the larger regional picture. As Glassow(1985:61) points out contract funded archaeology site evaluations are “extremely limited since the context of these excavations has usually been small-scale testing programs for purposes of significance assessment. This has resulted in the destruction of an unknown number of sites along with the research data. This destruction of sites and loss of information and its relevance was addressed by Glassow(ibid:58 where in a discussion of “The Significance of Small Sites to California Archaeology”, he makes the following observation: “Not only are small sites seldom investigated, but they are frequently assessed as having no appreciable significance to research and are therefore being destroyed by land development with little or no data recovery.” While Glassow’s(ibid:64) objective was not to

RINCON BAND OF LUISEÑO INDIANS

Culture Committee

1 W. Tribal Road · Valley Center, California 92082 ·
(760) 297-2621 or (760) 297-2622 & Fax: (760) 749-8901



condemn the destruction of sites, he did call for their preservation “on *a priori*” grounds until such time that adequate investigation might take place...the full significance of the site may not be demonstrated until more is known about the contents of neighboring sites, since so much of the research value of a small site is gained only when compared to data from other sites in the region.” The Rincon Tribe believes and asks that San Diego County like True and Waugh(1982:35) have suggested see Small Sites as in fact part of a larger community. As True, Meighan and Crew(1974:43) have suggested the larger outcrops containing multiple milling features were community milling areas and that each group or family within the community had its own specific milling boulder. As we understand and True et. al.¹ point out “each family woman had her mortar or group of milling elements that were passed down from mother to daughter”.

Based upon the evidence provided above including oral traditions, ethnohistoric and ethnographic accounts, surviving cultural features on the landscape and archaeological research, the Luiseño people believe this to be part of our traditional homeland. To that end we are asking that the County and developer to work with the Rincon Tribe to avoid where possible our Cultural Heritage. We thank you for the opportunity to submit this information to the County. If you should have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact the Rincon Cultural Resources Department at (760) 297-2635.

Sincerely,

Rose Duro
Rincon Culture Committee Chair

References

- Bean, Lowell John and Florence C. Shipek
1978 *Luiŕeño*: In handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, California, William C. Sturtevant, General Editor, Editor Robert F. Heizer Washington D.C. Smithsonian Institution pp. 551-563
- Glassow, Michael A
1985 The Significance of Small Sites to California Archaeology. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 7(1):54-68.
- Heizer, Robert F.
1978 *California*. Handbook of North American Indians. Vol. 8, William Sturtevant, General Editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.
- Kroeber, A. L.
1976[1925] *Handbook of The Indians of California*. Dover Publications, Inc. New York, New York.
- Masiel-Zamora, Myra Ruth
2013 *Analysis of éxva Teméeku, a Luiŕeño Indian Village Site Named Temeku, Located in Temecula, California*. A Masters Thesis Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.
- Oxendine, Joan
1983 *The Luiŕeño Village During the late Prehistoric Era*. A Ph.D. Dissertation Department of Anthropology, University of California Riverside.
- Sparkman, Philip S.
1908 The Culture of the Luiŕeño Indians. *University of California Publications In American Archaeology and Ethnology* 8(4):187-234.
- Strong, William Duncan
1972[1929] *Aboriginal Society in Southern California*. Malki Museum Press, Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning California.
- Sutton, Mark Q
2009 An End to the Intermediate: A Reevaluation of the Late Holocene Prehistory of Southern California. Paper given at the annual Meeting Society for California Archaeology
- True D. L., C. W. Meighan and Harvey Crew
1974 Archaeological Investigations at Molpa, San Diego County. California, *University of California Press* Vol. 11, 1-176.

True, D. L. and George Waugh

1982 Proposed Settlement Shifts during San Luis Rey Times: Northern San Diego
County, California. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 4(2):34-54.